



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/042,400	01/09/2002		Laura J. Poplawski	END920010032US1(14761) 9037		
7	7590	07/13/2005		EXAMINER		
Steven Fischr			LERNER, MARTIN			
Scully, Scott, N 400 Garden Ci		Presser	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Garden City, 1			2654			
				DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			100	POPLAWSKI, LA	URA J.				
			er	Art Unit					
		Martin Le	erner	2654					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic r Reply	cation appears on th	e cover sheet with	the correspondence ac	ddress				
THE N - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC sions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply we ply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e nication. days, a reply within the sta utory period will apply and will by statute, cause the ap	event, however, may a repl atutory minimum of thirty (i will expire SIX (6) MONTH aplication to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered time IS from the mailing date of this of IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication.				
Status									
1)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed	I on							
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2	b) This action is	non-final.						
•	,—								
Dispositi	on of Claims	,							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1 to 15 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 to 15 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	e withdrawn from o			•				
Applicati	on Papers								
9)□ -	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.							
10) 🗌 .	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any object	ion to the drawing(s)	be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) 🗆 .	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including to The oath or declaration is objected to	·		•					
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		•		·				
12) <u></u> / a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority of None of: 2. Certified copies of the priority of None of: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority of None of: application from the Internation of None of	locuments have be locuments have be f the priority docum al Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in App nents have been re ule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National	l Stage				
Attachment	· ·(s)								
1) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			nmary (PTO-413)					
3) 🛛 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/09/2002</u> .			Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PT	O-152)				

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 5 to 7, 10 to 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ballantyne et al.*

Regarding independent claims 1, 6, and 11, *Ballantyne et al.* discloses a method, system, and program instructions for converting XML data from a legacy computer system, comprising;

"providing a delimited flat file having columns with headings" – a "flat file" is a simple database model, where information is stored in a plain text file, with one database record per line, each record being divided into fields using delimiters at fixed column positions (Wikipedia); Figure 4 illustrates a flat file from COBOL legacy code, with one record per line, columns and headings for date, time, number, city, duration, cost, etc., where each column is delimited by fields (column 8, lines 46 to 58: Figure 4);

Art Unit: 2654

"providing a map file conforming to said document type definition file and having tags and attributes including references matching said headings" – modeling/mapping graphical user interface 30 illustrates the mapping relationship between the XML schema, the report data model, and the underlying legacy computer program application depicted as COBOL (column 10, lines 4 to 22: Figures 4 to 6); the mapping relationship is a program defining a mapping engine 24 for creating modified legacy program applications (column 10, lines 54 to 65); a mapping is defined by attributes and tags for XML to match reference headings in COBOL (column 12, lines 11 to 45); implicitly, a "document type definition file" defines elements of a document as being COBOL or XML;

"forming a tree structure from said map file wherein each tag represents one or more nodes of said tree" – a data structure for an XML schema is a tree structure of elements (column 11, lines 29 to 47: Figures 7 and 7A); elements corresponds to tags for XML;

"traversing node-by-node said tree structure and for each said node entering said attributes into said markup language file" – a tree structure is utilized for rewriting a legacy program code from COBOL into XML ("said markup language file") by traversing the elements of a tree structure for each element (column 11, lines 29 to 47: Figures 7 and 7A);

"when said attributes include one of said references, retrieving text from one of said columns with one of said matching headings of said flat file and entering said text into said markup language file" – tags are opened from an identified ancestor down

Art Unit: 2654

through the called node, and attributes of the nodes along the tree structure are emitted along with appropriate values (column 12, lines 32 to 45: Figure 8: Step 110); thus, text for name, address, phone number, etc., for a customer are translated from legacy program code in COBOL into XML for each element of text in a record.

Regarding claims 2, 7, and 12, *Ballantyne et al.* discloses a mapping relationship of mapping engine 26 defines correspondences between elements of a legacy program in COBOL and XML (column 10, lines 4 to 30); implicitly, mapping is applied for all corresponding elements.

Regarding claims 5, 10, and 15, *Ballantyne et al.* discloses a legacy file in COBOL, which is a flat file delimited by tabs defining columns for date, time, number, city and state, duration, cost, etc. (Figure 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ballantyne et al.* in view of *Baisley et al.*

Ballantyne et al. omits the steps of providing a map file for default text for certain elements and attributes in the markup language, and entering the default text into the markup language for attributes having references that do not match headings of the flat

file. Ordinarily, it would be presumed that all corresponding elements of matching between a source flat file and an object file are provided, but it is well known that there are exceptional instances where they may not, whereupon a default procedure must be specified. (Analogously, when a file name is not specified for saving the file in Windows[®], opening text of a file is designated as a default file name.) Baisley et al. teaches a procedure for converting from one modeling language to another, wherein object models existing in a Uniform Modeling Language (UML) are converted to models existing in a Meta Object Facility Language (MOF). Specifically, it is stated that it is not always possible to generate a name for each unnamed element, and generated names often do not serve the purpose of describing the named element. Thus, when no name is provided, or when a name is omitted from both ends, the end's type may be a suitable name, a numeral may be appended to an offending name that violates a rule constraint of UML, or it may be given the name "Contains". (Column 4, Line 49 to Column 5, Line 67) The objective is to provide a set of rules for making a transformation between models in object-oriented programming languages with a predictable mapping. (Column 1, Lines 39 to 67) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to apply the default naming conventions taught by Baisley et al. in the method and system for modifying legacy programs into XML of Ballantyne et al. for the purpose of providing transformation rules between programming languages with a predictable mapping.

Art Unit: 2654

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Dingman et al., Tamura, Soetarman et al., Schwerdtfeger et al., Hyman et al., Sundaresan, and Fong et al. disclose related art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Martin Lerner whose telephone number is (571) 272-7608. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 7

ML 7/6/05

Martin Lerne

Examiner

Group Art Unit 2654